

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 21, 2004

Members of Community Development Committee present: Lane J. Beougher, Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent. Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Beougher: I'll call the Community Development Committee meeting to order at 7:42. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the June 7 Community Development Committee meeting. Are there any corrections or deletions to the minutes? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

The next item is the approval of the agenda. I would like to add - Discussion, Overlap of Streetscape, and Olde Reynoldsburg Revitalization areas - to the agenda tonight. That motion does not require a second. Are there any other additions to the agenda? Changes to the agenda? (No response). All in favor of the change to the agenda, please signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries. And that item will be item 3a.

And I apologize for just getting this to you tonight, but we are going to be bidding a project out of Mr. Clemens' committee which I think we might want to take a look at this. And I was hoping Mr. Parkinson would be here tonight and I'm going to be relying on Ms. Keefer to keep us informed. But I had a conversation with Dave last week in regard to the Graham/Main intersection, and I was told that the masts and poles are going to be standard ODOT issue. Galvanized steel, painted black. Basically a drawn steel tube. Not much ornament on it. And it came to my attention, which standard do we apply? Because we've got the Olde Reynoldsburg Revitalization area which does not have any masts and poles in the traffic signalization. Then we've got the last phase of the Streetscape Program out that way and those two areas overlap by about 1,000 feet. And I guess my concern is, where are we starting and stopping the two areas? The Streetscape Program shows the intersection at Graham and Main as the start of Phase, what is it 5? 6? 7? I can't remember. Anyway, the last phase goes from Graham and Main out to the east city limit. And the Olde Reynoldsburg area stops about where Eye Care Associates is, just past Catfish Charley's. So we have an overlap of about 1,000 feet. And I guess my question to the committee is, should we adjust one, or both of those boundaries to make sense so we don't have a conflict?

The second question's I guess, and this would be referred to Safety is, since we are bidding that intersection improvement in a couple of weeks, should we take a look at whether that signalization should conform to the standard? And have I lost everybody, or is everybody with me?

Mr. Hills: There are a lot of people that would say I've been lost forever. I think when we refer to Olde Reynoldsburg, and I don't want to complicate this more, but Olde Reynoldsburg is defined by signs depicted out there currently, which is from the, I believe the east side of the bridge out to somewhere just a little bit past Jackson Street. And that truly was the Olde Reynoldsburg. And I think there are historic signs that are put up before that. When years ago, we decided to improve Olde Reynoldsburg, I think we expanded on that. And at the time we were referring up to the front of City Hall and out past what used to be Theo's which is now Catfish Charley's. So I think we expanded on what the true definition of Olde Reynoldsburg is. Mayor, you correct me if I'm

wrong on that, but I'm sure it was depicted somewhere else. Now the standards in Streetscape were not even discussed when we did the standards for the historic area. I know that Graham and Main are not truly in the historical, documented Olde Reynoldsburg. But I certainly do think we put the standards out there.

Mr. Beougher: Right. But they are included in the plan that Edsall and Associates put forward and part of the book that, my understanding, that Council adopted at one point.

Mr. Hills: There's no doubt. I think that at a given point, if it came up, Council adopted it. Yes. It was the Edsall Plan, and it did expand out to that area. Certainly when that plan was approved, I can assure you no one talked about Streetscape, or thought about Streetscape, at that given day. But you bring up a good point of which standard is appropriate.

Mr. Beougher: Well, the Streetscape Program does show a shading on the street just east of the Main and Graham intersection. So depending on how you look at it, we either have no standard or we have two standards. And I'm just trying to get some clarification from all of you on what we want to see happen. And if we want to see something happen at that intersection, should we be looking at an alternate when we go to bid. It would be a shame to tear down a five year old pole and replace it with something nicer when we can get the same thing for a few more dollars.

Mr. Hills: I don't think in our current construction plans, Phase 5 or 6 of the Streetscape will be finished in 5 years.

Mr. Beougher: True. Maybe ten?

Mayor McPherson: Ten, maybe.

Mr. Clemens: If we do them in that section, ten. I think it would look kind of strange to put red poles out there and nothing else.

Mr. Beougher: True.

Mr. Hills: It would make the public think that we started it and stopped. And that's what we're trying to show, some consistency now. That's a good comment.

Mr. Beougher: Mrs. Reichard.

Mrs. Reichard: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. When Mr. Parkinson asked me about what color the lamps should be, were we going to match old or new, being either red or black, it just made sense, since going down through Olde Reynoldsburg, it's black, that we would continue with that. But at no time did I think that it was just going to be one of the standard galvanized poles painted black. I thought it was going to match the Streetscape. I thought that was part of it. But I should also tell you that in the event we choose to do that, it takes about 6 months, 5 to 6 months to get those poles, once they're ordered. The ones like we have in Streetscape. So it would hold that, I would assume we could probably go ahead and do the construction without the poles. But it would be

January before we could erect the new...

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I'm going to call on Ms. Keefer now and ask her for her understanding of the construction schedule. Are you aware of what that schedule is?

Ms. Keefer: I am not aware of the construction schedule.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Can you and Mr. Parkinson come back to the next committee meeting with a report and let us know? I think at that time, that will be the week that we're going to bid and that bidding period is what, 3 weeks, 2 weeks?

Mrs. Reichard: (Inaudible).

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So we might have some time to issue an addendum.

Mrs. Reichard: The whole idea was to get it to Council prior to the recess so that we could begin on or about September 4th, or 5th or something like that.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mrs. Reichard: The last conversation I had with Mr. Parkinson, that's what it was. But then of course we have to finish up, Mr. Underwood has to file. I think the only one that we've settled on is WeJoySing and I think the other one, he has to file in court. Once that's done, we can immediately go out for the bid.

Mr. Beougher: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: I think that.. you want to think about it. I still don't think we should go with the red out there. There may come a point in 4 or 5 years that we don't continue the Streetscape and we may want to continue what it looks like in the Olde Reynoldsburg out that way. Because it would be cheaper. Because we've got a lot of vacant area out there. The cemetery and the other things like that. So I don't think we want to jump out there with something we have and go red and look strange and people wonder what we're doing now any way. Let's not make them think any more about it.

Mr. Beougher: On the other hand we're going to get questions if we tear it down and put in something new. Mr. Baxter, and then I'll recognize the Mayor.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. A question I have for Sharon, do we have the possibility of having the same decorative poles we presently have in Olde Reynoldsburg, the black ones rather than, I know the conversation is to stick to just straight poles out there, or go to the new style that we have in Streetscape? The question I have is, can we go back to what we presently have and install those to keep the continuity to what Olde Reynoldsburg looks like today? And is there a delay of 7 months as well?

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Baxter, you're talking about the light poles only?

Mr. Baxter: Light poles. Correct.

Mr. Beougher: I'm talking to the signalization poles. The poles with the mast arms. And my understanding is that's what takes several months lead time.

Mr. Baxter: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you. As Sharon indicated, we did talk about, Mel, whether to put red or black in, and we agree with you on that. Black makes more sense, and that's the route that we went on it, not the red.

Mr. Beougher: Let me ask. Is Sharon's recollection correct? It was to be the decorative poles? Or was it to be a simple....

Mayor McPherson: As I recall, and I don't recall even talking to Sharon about this, but I recall when I looked at it, it's just going to be the standard signalization poles. It's not going to be the decorative. I think the decorative not only were considerably more, but it was going to take 7 to 8 months to get in.

Mr. Beougher: All right. Ms. Keefer, could you possibly look at the schedule and also compare costs and let us know? Provide us with more information at the next meeting?

Ms. Keefer: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: Just further comment. In the old town. The actual old town revitalization area, we don't have any signalization that match the light poles or anything like that. We did not go with changing the signalization when we did that project. So they're all pretty much the standard. And if Council would so choose and they wanted to replace the signalization down through there with mast arms, we would have plenty of time to order them in for the entire section starting at Lancaster Avenue all the way out. I'm sure EMH&T would get us a price on doing all that so they'd all be consistent.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. We'll hold this item for two weeks and we'll move on to item 4. This item came from, Sharon did you send this down?

Mrs. Reichard: (Inaudible).

Mr. Beougher: The Mayor did. Okay. Mayor McPherson.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. This is a request to move the Planning

Administrator's position from the Development Department where it now exists, to the Safety/Service Department. We also put on there what it would be required to transfer funds within the accounts to accomplish that. In talking with Mr. Brandt and Mrs. Reichard, Stephen and the previous Planning Administrator feel that it is best suited to be in the Service/Safety Department rather than in the Development Department, thereby eliminating any possible or perceived conflicts. And so this is a simple request to just transfer the position from the one department to the other. And also the funding that goes with it.

Mr. Beougher: Whether or not we enact this, the position is going to be advertised and filled regardless of what department it's in?

Mayor McPherson: It already has been. Yes.

Mr. Beougher: Any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Any comments? (No response). I do know that there has been some issues with coordination of duties between the Building Department and the Planning Administrator. At least that's what we've heard. And it certainly makes sense to keep everything in one department and have one secretary serving all parties involved. Hopefully it will only be one secretary.

Any one else have any comments? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher, the only comment I have, and I think it is strictly as a comment, and Mayor or Sharon if I'm incorrect on this, please let me know. Barbara has left now. Is that correct? Was Friday her last day?

Mr. Beougher: The 16th.

Mr. Hills: She certainly was an asset to this city and she represented her job here very well and I commend her for that. I have never heard anything but compliments about Barbara. So it's unfortunate some times when you loose employees, but better deals come along and you encourage young people to move with their efforts. However, I would note that if I understand from talking with Mrs. Reichard, she is confident and I believe the Mayor is too, the duties that Barbara had, in the interim, will be taken care of by secretarial staff and the Building Department. Is that correct?

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. We're going to divide it up among several different people and try to keep it rolling without, we want to try to make it as seamless as possible until we get a new person on.

Mr. Hills: I think the Administration is certainly to be commended that that's going to happen. Because I think one of the problems before had been, as Mr. Beougher said, potentially with some communication. And so I think that this will be a nice system to see how well this works as we're going through this process. I just want the public to know that the role that she was performing is still going to continue to be performed. It's just by the efforts of a greater number of people. Not as a primary job position, but certainly to fill in the blanks.

Mrs. Reichard: If I may. Mr. Brandt, and myself, and Stephen Moore, our Chief Building Inspector, the secretary from that department, the Safety secretary and the Service secretary from my department, we all met and went through how we can, with Barbara before she left, and how could we spread these duties out, and Susie from the Council office, I think most of you know that she was the secretary in the Building Department at one time, so everybody came to the table and we discussed how we were going to make this happen. We had a six weeks crisis plan as we call it, to get through. And it is amazing the amount of things that Barbara did do and what her position calls for. So we've got for example, Stephen Moore answering the zoning questions as much as he can in terms of Major Site Plans and things that Barbara perused, some of those are going to have to be farmed out. We're going to be working with the planning people at EMH&T. Obviously, we hope there aren't too many because that could get costly. But everybody has really stepped up to the plate and I for one thank everyone that's been involved in trying to get us through. I should also add that we've received probably 8 or 9 resumes and they are stellar. There are some really good folks with the right kind of credentials and the education and the background and the experience to step in and hopefully make this a seamless process. But as we all know, it takes time. The posting goes down on Friday so we're hoping to start our interviews next week. Mrs. TenHoeve, as her calendar allows, has agreed to sit in on those interviews as long as it doesn't get too _____, but really to help us through that process. So I appreciate that too. So that should bring you up to date where we are.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. I would just note that the Charter also establishes the Service Department as the host of zoning inspections and zoning duties. So this probably makes sense. It probably should have been there from the beginning. But we're correcting the mistake. Are there any other comments? (No response). I'd like to move this forward for first reading at next week's Council meeting. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Baxter. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries.

And we stand adjourned at 8:00.

Community Development Committee
- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council
(Transcribed - Susie Smith)
June 21, 2004

SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES June 21, 2004

Members of Safety Committee present: Mel Clemens, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Lane J. Beougher, Antoinette Newman. Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.
Other member of Council: Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Clemens: I'll bring the Safety Committee meeting to order at 8:01. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the June 7, 2004 Safety Committee meeting. Are there any additions or deletions? (No response). If not, they'll stand approved.
The next item is the approval of the agenda. I'd like to add a speaker as 3a on the agenda.

Are there any other additions or deletions? (No response). If not, it'll stand approved.

The next item 3a, I have a speaker, John Shaffer. Would you please come to the mike and give your name, address, and so forth?

Mr. Shaffer: Yes. Ladies and gentlemen, and Chairman of the Council, I recently moved back here...

Mr. Clemens: Mr. Shaffer, would you give them your name and address and everything?

Mr. Shaffer: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes. John Shaffer, 1635 Haft Drive, Reynoldsburg, 43068. I recently moved back to Ohio and I'll cover that later. My basic complaint is that all residents apparently are not treated the same. As an example, TV antennas I understand, do not require building permits. Amateur radios apparently do. TV antennas could be just as large and perhaps complicated as amateur radio antennas depending on their exact use. As a matter of fact, most of my antennas, amateur antennas I plan to put up are going to be used for transmitting and receiving amateur television and commercial television stations also. Your building permits do not include or request details or sketches. However, I furnished a sketch as a courtesy because I felt it was really necessary if you didn't know what I was going to do. It appears that your local people do not have the experience to determine whether the requested installation, despite a detailed sketch furnished, meets the code requirements. Without consulting with the applicant, myself, they charged to consult an outside city source for help. I feel this could have been prevented by contacting the applicant to at least inform him of the possible additional cost and perhaps check his qualifications for planning the project. The entire cost of the antenna and structure that I want to install is approximately \$150. The building permit was priced at \$190. I expected to pay a fee but not one as costly as that. I'm a retired technical support and consultant for a major communications company with full experience in communications equipment including antennas and towers. My last employment was with Syntonic Technology in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania working out of Harrisburg on all the state contracts that were held by my company. I was responsible for servicing, inspection, and information of towers up to 250 feet tall. Prior to that I spent 8 years as service manager for the same company in Columbus, Ohio. We serviced and advised many different users throughout Ohio including the City of Reynoldsburg. I hold an FCC Commercial License since 1948 and my Amateur Radio License since 1951. I started installing TV antennas in 1948 and I have an excellent record. I returned to Ohio in April of 2004 due to health problems. I needed to move into a house all on one floor and have the help of my two sons living in the area. I prefer living in a less congested area, but my children asked us to move into Reynoldsburg. However, I wish I had followed my original plan and moved back to Licking County where we resided in the '70's. I realize time and circumstances change, but people such as I, on a fixed income, simply need the courtesy of consideration and complete financial information up front.

Amateur radio operators, in case you're not aware of it, provide a lot of free services; we're not allowed to charge for our services. That includes Sky One. I participated in the Sky One tornado watch in Ohio in the '70's. I think we started it actually during the time I was here. Emergency Management is another area that uses amateur radio operators. Non-profit organizations such as the Salvation Army, Red Cross, etcetera. So I just feel that I've really been put upon here. With the \$190 charge that, I expected to pay \$50, \$60, maybe \$70. But \$190, I

just simply couldn't afford to pick that up due to all of the moving expenses and my fixed income prior to today. I did pick it up today and paid it under duress. Thank you very much. If anybody has any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you, Mr. Shaffer. Council approves the codes and also approves the fees at the recommendation of the Building Department and recommendation of Mrs. Reichard. Have you had the opportunity to set up an appointment with Mrs. Reichard or Mayor McPherson to discuss this issue?

Mr. Shaffer: I'm sorry. I didn't get the...

Mr. Clemens: Have you had the opportunity to set up a meeting with Mrs. Reichard, our Service Director, or Mayor McPherson to discuss the issue that you brought to Council?

Female: They haven't been available.

Mr. Shaffer: No.

Mr. Clemens: I think they're available if you would call their secretaries and set up an appointment. It is an Administrative matter and I think that would be the place to make the discussion.

Mr. Shaffer: My point is, I think that certainly if the Building Permit was going to exceed the normal fee, that I should have been at least contacted and given an idea of what was happening. I assumed that you were going to approve the Building Permit here. And I waited, and I waited, and finally I got a call on my answering machine when I was out. And I was about to call to find out what the status of the Building Permit was.

Mr. Clemens: Correct. But I do know that they send them out. If you could, set up an appointment with Mrs. Reichard or Mayor McPherson to discuss the issue if you could please. Thank you. Are there any questions for Mr. Shaffer? Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens, I don't have a question for Mr. Shaffer, but I do have a question for Mrs. Reichard. Mrs. Reichard, I'm hearing some of the same things that this gentleman just expressed. One of the things that I'm hearing is that there isn't much consistency I guess in the approval process of plans. Do you know, are we using the same service or whoever we're outsourcing this to for these? Are we jumping around to different folks to do this?

Mrs. Reichard: No. We use Asebrook and by ordinance they have up to 30 days to approve the plans. Now they usually get them in less than 10 and it depends upon what's on their plate. They take them as they come in. They never put one before the other. They take them as they come in. But we've been pretty successful in getting them in within 10 days.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Well I had a conversation with a builder this week and he's building the same house three times, and each time he submits the plans to the city they come back with different

mistakes I guess, that need to be corrected on the plans. So I was wondering why that's happening.

Mrs. Reichard: Well I will say from time to time, especially with one of our major developers out here, the folks that work for him locally complain quite a bit about our Building Department. And what I found out when I got everybody in the same room was that they were, let's say they were less than honest with the individual they were reporting to. And once we got everybody on the same page it was amazing how smoothly things would go. But people want favors. People want to be put ahead. People want to be first. And we have a process and we do it according to the ordinances that are set forth in this city. And some people just don't have the patience or the time to wait on that process. But it is, we go by the code.

Mr. Stake: I can fully appreciate that. I just want us to be fair consistently.

Mrs. Reichard: That's the problem. We are fair and consistent.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Clemens: Mrs. Reichard, it's my understanding that if a developer or a builder, he can put in plans for a house on record. If he's doing the same house, I know that they do, I know that bigger developers, they build the same house 50 times over, that plan doesn't have to go in to be approved all the time. Is that correct?

Mrs. Reichard: I'm sorry, Mr. Clemens. I can't answer that. I would have to ask Mr. Moore.

Mr. Clemens: It should be. I mean, that's what it used to be.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah. That is correct, Mr. Clemens. They can put one set of plans in there for the approval and build several houses off that one set of plans. That is still the policy. And most builders that build more than one house do that very thing.

Mr. Clemens: I thought that's the way it worked.

Mayor McPherson: Yeah.

Mr. Hills: Mrs. Reichard, if you could just stay there just for one second.

Mrs. Reichard: Certainly.

Mr. Hills: We could go back to, and this is just for clarification in my mind. Is our posted fee for antennas \$190?

Mrs. Reichard: I don't know. This is the first I've heard of this.

Mayor McPherson: \$140.

Mr. Hills: \$140?

Mayor McPherson: \$140. I don't know what the other 50 he's talking about.

Mr. Shaffer: It's \$50 according to this report. I was charged \$140 for the services of your outside consultant. But the Building Permit itself was \$50. Which I consider high, but fair.

Mr. Hills: I think you need to get with Mrs. Reichard. I would like when this is resolved, or at least when everybody agrees, I would like to know if you'd let Council know what is the fee. Is it 50? And if for some reason it is farmed out...

Mr. Clemens: I think the fee is, like it's 50 and we have no control really what we're going to be charged. I mean, really when it goes to the outsource it could have came back _____.

Mayor McPherson: The \$140, when I say that's from anything, I apologize. That's not the permit fee. But that is for the service that this particular tower was sent out. The company charged the \$140 and so then that fee is passed on to the consumer. I know the gentleman said he was an expert and he could, we could have consulted with him, but I think that probably isn't the way the process has to work. You have to go to an outside consultant to verify the plans. In particular, in the case of a ham radio operator, there's guy wires, there's how they are hooked to everything. So I mean, there's just more than just a simple small TV antenna.

Mr. Hills: After Mr. Shaffer has the meeting, if we could just have an update of what the result was. I'd appreciate it.

Mrs. Reichard: I'd be more than happy to.

Mr. Clemens: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stearns: My question is, who is the outside consultant that charges us \$140?

Mayor McPherson: Stacey and Asebrook, which they are the outside architectural engineers that we contracted with and they do the outside plans reviews.

Mr. Stearns: Okay.

Mr. Clemens: They have a 2 year contract that we're in the process now...

Mayor McPherson: Two year contract recently renewed. They've had it for several years and have done an excellent job for us.

Mr. Clemens: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Shaffer.

The next item on the agenda is Discussion, Liquor Permit Request, Transfer, from

Raymond Lee dba Jades Restaurant to Pings Jade Restaurant Inc. dba Jades Restaurant, 1304 Aida Dr., Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068. Chief Miller.

Chief Miller: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. The police department conducted an investigation into this application. I think it's probably something that should be noted as that over the course of since 1995 we have over 50 entries to that address but the vast majority of them are for our personnel to eat there. We have had two drunk runs since 1995. And for a liquor licensed establishment, that's very, very limited. If you're familiar with this location, the person who is purchasing the business and the license has been an employee there and has no plans on changing the style of the restaurant or the direction of the business. And we would not, we recommend that it move forward without any objection from City Council.

Mr. Clemens: That's what we'll do then. City Council will move forward with no objections. it. The next item on the agenda, Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Section 549.02 "Carrying Concealed Weapons" Subsection (c) of Chapter 549 Weapons and Explosives. It had the first reading 6-14-04. Any discussion on this for Mr. Underwood? Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: You had some language changes, Mr. Clemens. Have those been issued or did I miss them as far as where the smoking areas were?

Mr. Clemens: No. This is the wrong thing.

Mr. Beougher: I'm sorry. I thought we had combined that.

Mr. Clemens: No. Smoking is not an explosive weapon. This is in the wrong place.

Mr. Beougher: Well, loaded cigars.

Mr. Clemens: That's true.

Mr. Beougher: My apologies.

Mr. Clemens: That's fine. Are there any questions for Mr. Underwood on this? (No response). If not, it's had its first reading, I'll make a motion that we send it to Council for a second reading as a rule suspension. Second by Mr. Stake. All in favor, say aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Okay. It'll be sent to Council for the second reading with a rule suspension.

And that closes the meeting at 8:16.

Safety Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

June 21, 2004

SERVICE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June 21, 2004

Members of Service Committee present: Lane J. Beougher, Ron Stake, Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Mel Clemens, Antoinette Newman. Chairman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Other member of Council present: Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Beougher: I'll call Service to order at 8:16. Item 2 on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of June 7 Service Committee meeting. Are there any corrections to the minutes of June 7? (No response). Hearing and seeing none, they will stand as submitted.

The next item is the approval of the agenda and I have several changes to the agenda. I would like to add 2004 Sanitary Sewer Televising Inspection Project to tonight's agenda. And I would like to hold items 5 (Discussion, Commercial Corridor Revitalization Project/Phase II Utilities), 6 (Discussion, Comprehensive Right of Way ordinance), 7 (Discussion, License to allow installation of drain to correct water accumulation problem), and 9 (Discussion, Development impact fees). Are we holding 4 as well. Mr. Hills? Is that the consensus?

Mr. Hills: I think that after discussion, I wanted to talk about 4 because 4 and 3a sort of perform the same service.

Mr. Beougher: Very good. So the motion is to add the televised services, hold items 5, 6, 7 and 9. The motion does not require a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye").

Motion carries.

Item 3a, 2004 Sanitary Sewer Televising Inspection Project. Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: Thank you. This is a request, an ordinance authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with Metropolitan Environmental Services for the 2004 Sanitary Sewer Televising Inspection Project. We received permission to advertise this for bids and these are the results of those bids.

Mr. Beougher: Missed it by \$20.

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: That's very tight. Okay. Any questions or comments from members of Council? (No response). One comment that _____ was our servicer last year and they are not the low bidder this year. Metropolitan is a company out of Hilliard. And they're the apparent low. And we want to do this as a rule suspension. We want to get it in place before we go on break as I understand it.

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: And when do you want to start doing the work?

Mr. Kipp: We'll probably start as soon as they get the permission and it's dry enough. This is all easement work. They'll be in the back yards so it will need to dry out some before they would start.

Mr. Beougher: My yard's a little wet. Any other questions? (No response). I would like to move this forward with a referral to the Finance Committee? Is this in the budget? I'm sorry. In the Sewer Capacity Fund.

Mr. Kipp: It's out of our CIP Fund.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. And it's for \$27,736.40 from the Sewer Capacity Fund to be transferred to account no. 720.736.5365, Line Maintenance Account. So it will need referral to Finance. So that's the motion. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? Yes, Mrs. Frazier.

Mrs. Frazier: Do you want the rule suspension on the first reading?

Mr. Beougher: Did you want it to go for more than one reading?

Mr. Kipp: Not as far as I'm concerned.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I'll amend my motion to send this forward.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: We can do that at Finance? Yes, Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: We could. But in that the two tie together, I don't know, that's where there was some overlapping questions between this and the other truck. And if he's not going to start this work immediately, would it be better rather than rule suspension, to see what other discussions come up as we discuss the truck. And then maybe do it as an emergency or something if more appropriate. But as you say, they're not going to get in anybody's back yard at your best estimate until when? You've been doing this for a number of years.

Mr. Kipp: Obviously, it'll be July. Some time in July...depends on if it's raining or not.

Mr. Hills: Your concern is if you have the ability for them to be out by the time we get out of session in July. Right?

Mr. Kipp: Yes.

Mr. Hills: Some of the questions I've received, these two tie together. The Jet truck and this project. Because they both do sort of the same thing. So if we could just send it and then I think he's all right if we came back the next time and had an emergency.

Mr. Beougher: Should we hold off in referring it to Finance until after its first reading? So we know which project to appropriate money for?

Mr. Hills: Historically, the longer we take before we send it, the less arguments there are about it once we get it.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. I'll tell you what. I will withdraw my motion.

Mr. Clemens: I'll withdraw the second.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Clemens. And I will move to send this forward for a first reading only. Is there a second? Mr. Clemens with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Kipp. Now you are also up for the second item.

Mr. Kipp: The second item is the request for the authorization of purchase through the state bid of one truck mounted high pressure sewer cleaner commonly known as the Jet Truck for the amount of \$129,000 from Jack Doheny Supplies Ohio, Inc. \$120,000 was set aside in the budget for this and I request an additional \$9,000 be appropriated from the unappropriated Sewer Fund. This is a, the Jet Truck is 15 years old and that's how long we planned to keep it.

Mr. Beougher: And my understanding is that the new truck will have the televising service, or capability along with it.

Mr. Kipp: Yes, it does.

Mr. Beougher: So we have the potential to save the \$27,700 every year possibly?

Mr. Kipp: No. What we've done, this started back in the '80's, rather than increasing in personnel, the number of personnel, we had somebody come in on a regular basis. And we started in Brookside, well we started in Olde Reynoldsburg. What they do, we set out a block of area where they go in, they clean. To televise the sewer, they look for, this is where a lot of our sewer maintenance comes from where we've repaired sewers before they collapse. So we went in, we started with our trouble spots. We went into Olde Reynoldsburg first. The oldest part of the system. Then we went to Brookside. We've been doing Huber. This section is all in Briarcliff and I selected this section to do because when we have high rains, we get some surging where some people get some water in their basements. I'm not sure where that water's coming from. Now as far as being a common area where we get a lot of sewer backups, no this isn't an area where we go in and clean on a preventative maintenance. We use our jet truck and TV-ing for when people call in and have problems. Commonly, if somebody says they're having a problem with the sewer, we'll go out and look at it. Other times they call us and say sewage is backing up in our basement. That's when we get our jet truck. We go out and we clear that sewer line. So we use our jet truck and TV-ing for all of the problem areas. So when we get an area where we get sewers where we have root problems, root problems is the biggest one, or grease build up is the other, we go in and we clean those. We clean areas anywhere from twice a year to every 3 years. This continually grows because each year we are adding a section of sewer to it where we hadn't had a problem before. So we do regular sewer cleaning and maintenance. Most of ours is in the areas where we've had problems. We do this, we go into these different areas as a preventative maintenance. And in this case we're looking, trying to find out if there is any inflow or roots or what may be causing our problems.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. So this purchase isn't going to save us any money. It will on maintenance.

Mr. Kipp: Actually the purchase saves us a lot of money when we have sewage in somebody's house. That's when this is where it's critical.

Mr. Beougher: There you go. Okay. Any questions? Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Stearns: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Mr. Kipp, did you say this new truck will not have the capabilities of doing the televising inspection like we normally do each year? Did you say that won't be able to do that?

Mr. Kipp: Okay. When I said this won't, it won't replace doing this project that we're spending the \$27,000 on. No. Will it be able to clean and TV sewers? Yes. And we will use it for that. And that's why we're buying it. So we will still be doing that, but the only thing it doesn't do, it doesn't, say that we need this sewer cleaned, this is a supplemental sewer cleaning that we do each year as part of maintaining the sanitary sewers.

Mr. Stearns: So in other words, this truck is just coming in with just certain items issued like

cleaning the sewer, right? Is that basically what you're saying?

Mr. Kipp: Yeah. What it does, it cleans the sanitary sewer. It'll clear a root. We use it to cut roots, clear grease. We'll go into, like I say, where we've had houses, if a house gets sewer backups, we put it on a regular thing where we go in there every so often like I say, anywhere from 6 months to every 3 years. We'll go back and clean that line so that they don't get another sewer .

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Could you kind of explain to me what kind of _____ does it have to do the routing. Does that work directly with the TV camera? Are they separated?

Mr. Kipp: They're separated. There's two reels that come out of the back of the truck. One reel is the hose reel that has the nozzles for the cleaning. It'll clean the sewer. With this one, and this is new technology; this hasn't been available previously .. than the last couple of years. Because the cameras are so much better. Our current camera, the one that we're trading in is this long and it has a different _____ system and it's not always easy to get in and out of manholes. One thing it doesn't always fit in the manhole at the bottom without some work. The other is that it is heavy and lowering it in and out. With this one, the camera's just on the end of the hose and then it's set on wheels and then it has water that also comes out with it. It's on like a half inch line. And then the water propels that camera down the line. So before, we had a camera set up on a trailer and everything and on the jet truck. With these, this is set up together so you can pull immediately when you're done cleaning the sewer if you have a question, which sometimes you do have roots, or did you get all the grease out, all you have to do is, you just grab the other hose and you could put that hose down the manhole and check it immediately.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think what Mark's trying to say, we could do the job but we'd have to put on additional personnel. Our personnel would be tied up.

Mr. Kipp: Either additional personnel or I could take them off from doing another job...

Mr. Clemens: That's what I meant.

Mr. Kipp: ...and do this.

Mr. Clemens: Right. We could do it but we don't have the personnel to do it and we'd have to have somebody and take them off of other jobs and tie them up.

Mr. Kipp: This is very effective and is proved very beneficial to the city to do this. Like I said, this has been in place since the mid 80's or so. And we just now started bidding it out because we wanted to get more footage done.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Two quick questions. I understand that this is supplemental for the first discussion in 3a and that makes sense. The second part of that, I guess that's more of a statement than question. The second part is, what's happening to the old truck? You said you're trading it in I thought I heard?

Mr. Kipp: We're trading the jet truck and the camera system.

Mr. Baxter: And what are we getting back for that?

Mr. Kipp: We're getting about \$20,000 for them.

Mr. Baxter: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: So the actual price of the unit we're buying is 149?

Mr. Kipp: Actually the actual price, we're buying a demo unit and I think it was well over, the actual price was \$169,440 some dollars.

Mr. Beougher: What a deal.

Mr. Kipp: It did come with more than we had anticipated. We're actually _____ cheaper since it's a demo unit.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Beougher. Mr. Kipp, was this in this year's budget?

Mr. Kipp: Yes, it is.

Mr. Beougher: I see that you have \$120,000 set aside in this year's budget and you want an additional nine.

Mr. Kipp: Correct.

Mr. Beougher: So once again this will need to be referred to Finance. And I don't see a rule suspension or an emergency on this item.

Mr. Kipp: No. Whenever I get it is better. But no, there's no emergency or anything on it.

Mr. Beougher: Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: We have an operating jet truck now? If there's a problem we're able to go out and clean our main, just for clarification, as the press hears this and all of a sudden the house service line plugs up, we don't fix those. We're fixing the water mains and the sewer mains.

Mr. Kipp: The sewer mains, yes. We're doing sewer cleaning right now. We're continuing with our current truck, we're continuing to do this.

Mr. Hills: Our current one is operative and it's fine, it's just the new one has nicer gadgets. Better performance I guess you'd like to say.

Mr. Kipp: I'd rather replace it before it broke down rather than after.

Mr. Beougher: And I would ask Mr. Kipp, if you could provide (Tape Change) service life of the previous unit. I think Mr. Hills would appreciate that.

Mr. Kipp: Sure.

Mr. Beougher: I would like to send this forward for its.... Mr. Stearns. I'm sorry.

Mr. Stearns: Just one more question. What is the warranty? How long is the service warranty?

Mr. Kipp: I don't know exactly. It comes with full warranty even though it's a demo. I'd have to get out everything on it. But it still comes with a full warranty as if it was new.

Mr. Stearns: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: I'd like to send this forward for first reading and save referring it to Finance until a subsequent reading if that's all right with everyone. So I move to send this forward for first reading. Is there a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you, Mark.

Mr. Kipp: Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Skipping down to item 8. Mr. Ward. Storm Water Software. You're going to give us a better deal on this too, right?

Mr. Ward: Overall I hope so. Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Now you had come before us and presented another software package and that was from Franklin. Is that correct?

Mr. Ward: Yeah. We had discussed previously having Franklin Information Systems develop the software package that we need. Mr. Anthony and I met last Fall and discussed all this and this was held through the winter and through March until the budget was settled. At the request of Mr. Baxter, I knew that this other software package was out there, but didn't know much about it. So we've taken the last few weeks to check some things out. And from the information I believe you all got, some of the references we've received from other communities, they think very highly of the Asist Software. The great advantage with that is that once it is purchased, as soon as we can

get a little bit of training, we'll be able to use the software. Whereas the package with Franklin Information Systems is still under development and it could be next Spring before it's fully developed.

Mr. Beougher: And we'd be not Beta testing but Alpha testing and debugging the software as we go and encountering all kinds of problems potentially. So Mr. Baxter, I'll recognize you before you raise your hand. I know you have some questions.

Mr. Baxter: Well I'd like to commend you for taking the time to do what you have done. Looking out there and identifying that there was an existing package out there. And it makes more sense to go with a proven package than to be on the bleeding edge and use the city at that point as the new developer. And although I thought that it had some benefits in the past, I think we've learned from some of those benefits. I've looked at what you've presented. I think it's a good package and I would definitely recommend to Council that we head this direction over new development to take the current. Thank you.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you. Any other questions or comments? (No response). You're fully comfortable with this software and you're ready to go?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir. Our new Storm Water Pollution Control Officer starts next Monday and the sooner we can get the software, the better off we will be in order to comply with the EPA requirements. There's a lot of features in this software. Like I say, we'll be ready to be able to run with it as soon as we get, they will provide training and it will be installable on the city network. So, like the inspection forms, a lot of other information on there, that we'll be able to start recording all this on the computer rather than trying to do all this on paper.

Mr. Beougher: Now I know you have a secretary. How's the search for the other position going?

Mr. Ward: The Storm Water Pollution Technician starts next Monday.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. You have a person on board?

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Good. So you need some software for them to use.

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: This is a memo and I don't have the original legislative request, but do you want this as an emergency or what's the time line for this?

Mr. Ward: I would like to, as far as the wording, I would say for the financial needs of the city so that we can comply with the EPA regulations and not be fined.

Mr. Beougher: Well, we don't want to be fined. In that case, I will move this forward ... yes Mr.

Hills.

Mr. Hills: Just a statement. First of all, we never did have a piece of legislation because this has only been for discussion purposes previously. Mr. Ward, I do thank you for coming back with a system that is nationwide. I don't know if EMH&T may have helped you find that there were other people out there. Because certainly when we talked about this last, we were having someone come in and cut 50% off of their price in order to develop the software. And you've made a very good statement about nationwide EPA. They're not fining anybody yet and they're not ready to. They're having enough trouble getting their own program in place. That's why this is an unfunded mandate that says, you go do it. So we're not worried about fines. Does the system need to be up and running? If you've hired two employees, we better have the system up and running, because we don't need to be having them sit there and look at each other. But I don't know if Ms. Keefer from EMH&T mentioned this Asist, but I'm very happy to see that we went with a proven product. And I appreciate Mr. Baxter's efforts and whoever's it may have taken to look and see what was available. Because it is a nationwide program on storm water. It's mandatory. It has to be done. We're on the cutting edge. We're much farther than most cities. Is there a city in Franklin County that's farther ahead than us, Ms. Keefer? I think the answer to that's no, isn't it?

Ms. Keefer: Certainly not.

Mr. Hills: So we don't have to worry about being sluggish. We're not sluggish on this. We don't need a jet truck to move us along. We're way ahead. But we do need the software. We've got employees and we don't have the system in place. But I'm not sure if Mrs. Frazier wants to generate a piece of legislation or whether Administration would generate that by next week. There's no point in not going forward if we certainly have employees that are supposed to be using the software.

Mr. Beougher: Since Ms. Keefer is here, Kim are we doing the right thing here? What is your opinion of this software?

Ms. Keefer: Yes. I think you are doing the right thing.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you.

Ms. Keefer: (Inaudible).

Mr. Beougher: We keep hearing about engineering fees going up and up. Okay, well maybe we can save some money tonight. So Mr. Hills, you're suggesting that we hold this until the legislation is created?

Mr. Hills: It's up to Council. But if it could be prepared.

Mr. Clemens: I would like to have a legislation request. We have nothing. Now if it can be done by next Monday night, that would be fine.

Mrs. Frazier: You have that information.

Mr. Hills: I have not seen one. I've seen a lot of old comments.

Mrs. Frazier: October, 2003.

Mr. Hills: I had the follow-up comments. If there's one out there, that's all right.

Mr. Beougher: We can amend the legislation and get it put together for next week's meeting?

Mrs. Frazier: Yes.

Mr. Beougher: And we also need to refer to Finance. And we know what fund this is coming out of. This is the Storm Water Utility Fund.

Mr. Ward: Yes, sir.

Mr. Beougher: Okay. Mr. Stake, do I need anything else before I refer it to you? Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Just one last comment. I believe the Computer Department's already approved everything on this as well. You had mentioned that in your comments and I also read it in some documentation I thought. I just wanted to make sure that's clear, that our Computer Department has looked at this and is okay with the software. Our system's able to handle it. And I didn't see any need for improvement. I heard there is potentially a server needed.

Mr. Ward: Right. That's one advantage to this software versus Franklin Systems. This software, the additional software is already in the program where we will be able to download from the lap top that the Pollution Control Technician will be using, directly to the server to update the files every day. Whereas with Franklin, that would be an additional \$995 just for that software.

Mr. Baxter: Just a note, the Computer Department has already prepared this and approved it.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Baxter. With that, I would make a motion to move this forward for passage as an emergency and referring it to Finance for appropriation of funds. Is there a second? Mr. Baxter with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Any opposed? (No response). Motion carries. Thank you, Mr. Ward.

The last item on the agenda is the Ordinance accepting two unrecorded deeds of easement (Parkview Presbyterian Church, Maria T. Ong and Jerry Ong). This is for the bikeway. Huber Park to Blacklick Woods Park. And Mrs. Frazier informed me tonight that it is actually three deeds of easement. Is that correct?

Mrs. Frazier: That's correct.

Mr. Beougher: So we will need to amend this at the table when it goes for passage hopefully next week. Is there any discussion on this item? (No response). Hearing none, I would like to move this forward for its third and final reading with a recommendation for adoption. Is there a second? Mr. Stake with the second. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, signify by saying aye. (All voted "Aye"). Motion carries. This will go forward for passage next week.

With that, I will adjourn Service at 8:42.

Service Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

June 21, 2004

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

June, 21, 2004

Members of Finance Committee present: Ron Stake, Mel Clemens, Lane J. Beougher.
Councilman Eric Gilbert was absent.

Other members of Council present: Preston Stearns, Brett Baxter, Antoinette Newman, Council President William L. Hills.

Mr. Stake: I'd like to call the June 21 Finance Committee meeting to order at 8:43. The second item on the agenda is the approval of the Finance Committee meeting held June 7, 2004. Any changes to those minutes? (No response). None being heard, they'll stand.

Item number 3 is approval of the agenda. I have a couple of changes to the agenda. Item 3a will be the Additional Appropriation for the software for NPDES Phase 2. And I would like to hold item number 12 (Ordinance to amend the Code of Ordinances of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio, Section 160.03 "Salary Schedule" Subsections (a) and (b) of Chapter 160, Employee Compensation). Any other changes to the agenda? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item 3a is the referral from Service. The additional appropriation from the Storm Water Utility. Here we'll be appropriating \$8,155.75 from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund to account number 740.737.5633 for the development and purchase of the software to meet the NPDES Phase 2 requirements. Mr. Beougher.

Mr. Beougher: Thank you, Mr. Stake. I think you basically covered it all. We do have employees on board and ready to start using the software. So we need to get it in place.

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake.

Mr. Stake: Yes.

Mrs. Frazier: Is that price changed to \$7,995?

Mr. Stake: I'm reading the original appropriation here.

Mr. Ward: The new price for the Asist is \$7995.

Mr. Stake: Okay.

Mr. Beougher: And that \$7995 includes the first year's maintenance agreement.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Then I will change that to \$7,995 from the unappropriated Storm Water Fund. Thank you, Mrs. Frazier. Okay we have a recommendation to send this forward from Service and I also will make a recommendation that we send this forward as an emergency from Finance. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion on this? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 4 is Discussion, Amend Chapter 160 and amend Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual, Group Life Insurance, Longevity, and I guess typo's that were in there. This comes from Mayor McPherson. Mayor.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Stake. The first piece of legislation you have before you is requesting an update of Chapter 160, and to our Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual. This deals with Section 4.01 of Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual. Section (a), wherein we're changing effective 1-1-2004, the Longevity pay to the employees that are members of 160. And you'll see we're increasing that \$50 per increment. The second is 160.07, Longevity, and again that change effective 1-1-2004 also increases longevity by \$50 for each increment. We've also requested Group Life Insurance be increased effective 1-1-05 to a minimum of \$50,000 or one time the annual salary life insurance. And then we've made a couple of corrections to, just 6.6 becomes 6 Lieutenant's and I believe we had two 4's under 160.11. We've changed that from a 4 to a 5. And then the next paragraph will be paragraph 6.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Any questions for the Mayor in regards to this item from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Mayor, we discussed this. I believe these to be reasonable requests. So I have no problem with moving this forward for its first reading if that's all right with members of the committee. So I'll make a motion that we move this forward for its first reading. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response).

Mrs. Frazier: Mr. Stake, you have two. You need one for Chapter 160 and then one for the Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual. It's two different things that you have to amend. So if you want to apply that motion to both, that's fine. But it'll have to be two separate ordinances.

Mr. Stake: Well I guess seeing as how I did it already, I'd like to apply it to both and then we can recognize it as two separate ordinances down the road if that's okay with everybody. Thank you, Mrs. Frazier.

Item number 5, Discussion, Amend 160.08 and amend Personnel Policy and Procedure Manual to make lump sum payments the same percent as other increases. Mayor, I believe this is yours as well.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you. This is a recommendation to amend Chapter 160.08 (b), Individual Merit Increases, Section 1. If you go to the end of it, the last paragraph under (b) sets out an example of how people were paid under the 160. We would like to add to that sample "the remainder of the merit increase will be paid to the employee in the form of a 1% lump sum payment". What this does is allow the lump sum payment that in the past we've done on an individual basis and listed all the names. So rather than list the individual names, whatever City Council increases the pay ranges to, anything in excess of that amount would be paid to the employees a lump sum rather than add it on to their pay. Under Section 3.20, under the Policies and Procedures Manual, we have again changed the verbiage. It's identical to what I just read to you before. Under Section 3, we clarified rather the increase in the CPI used by Council, etc., it would be the merit increase allowed by Council. And those were the only changes that we

recommended in that. I did run this by Mr. Underwood. I met with him. I read the verbiage to him. I also handed it to him and he read it and he felt that it did in fact accomplish what we were trying to accomplish. And that is to get the lump sum payment for those people who are above the maximum of the pay range after City Council makes their adjustment in the pay ranges.

Mr. Stake: I don't hear any objections from Mr. Underwood. So I guess that's correct. Any questions from members of the committee or comments? (No response). Members of Council? Mr. Hills.

Mr. Hills: I know we had a discussion earlier and there was a little confusion on this. Sitting here trying to, and Mrs. Frazier was nice enough to pull an ordinance we passed 12-16-02. In that ordinance we authorized the employees to be paid outside the range. That's where we had the listing. I think if we put history back in place, the Clemans, Nelson report had not been adopted at that time. In the Clemans, Nelson report I believe is where it was determined you can't pay outside the range other than through a lump sum payment. And that's where the structure came up.

Mayor McPherson: Exactly.

Mr. Hills: Clemans, Nelson was adopted in '03. We passed the rate increase in '02 to be effective in '03. This is the first time now that we're looking at an '04 increase. I think the changes, this will be the first time if I understand this properly, that we actually had paid, if you're above your range and the percentage of increase would take you outside your range, that amount of monies must be paid in a lump sum consistent with our current policies. Does that sound correct there?

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. In the past, prior to Clemans, Nelson, you're absolutely correct. It was done on an individual basis by name and paid that way. But under the new policy, to be paid, we'd have to amend those two sentences in the policy to get to be paid above.

Mr. Hills: This is the first year we have a lump sum payment in lieu of every paycheck range.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Underwood, is that along your memory line also?

Mr. Underwood: Yes, it is, as to what the discussions were. What's written doesn't accomplish that. I have a couple of questions that have been nagging at me. Why have an upper limit on your range if we're going to keep paying outside the range? If we get rid of the upper limit, then you don't have to worry about it. The second thing is the merit increase. If you're going to dictate 3% to everybody where the percent is, and as appointing authority, if you've got people that are really just average, going along, doing their job, I don't think they deserve the same 3% as somebody you've got who is really putting out. So if you create a 3% pot, and let the appointing authority award as the people are performing, that's much better in my opinion. I think what the Mayor's presenting does in fact mirror the discussions that were held.

Mr. Hills: Mr. Underwood, I agree. Because the same term of 'merit' bothers me. But it is in the Policy and Procedure Manual because they were written that way, there is a time, and I believe it starts actually in '04...

Mayor McPherson: The end of this year.

Mr. Hills: ...that raises were, this year was to be the trial year, and then the following year was to be the actual merits. In that time, the goal was to have Council say, here is the amount of money that could be paid out in raises. Management, you determine who is going to get what based on the merit program. And we're not there yet. But yet we're working with an ordinance that reflects that because we're in that trial year. And I certainly don't disagree with what you're saying. It's sort of an awkward thing to blend during this period of time. Because we didn't say, here's the lump sum, we said here is the percentage, where that's what we've been asked to say any way. But you're right. The merit thing, it's not a true merit program in what action we're taking in '04. Actually we're taking late '04 or '05 for '05 was supposed to be based on a true merit program.

Mr. Underwood: And the old step method properly pursued would have been fine if you had to do the performance appraisal and the person earned the step instead of automatically paying every year. So there's two ways to skin that cat.

Mr. Stake: Something we need to think about for next year. Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I think the reason the change is being made is we wanted everybody to have a 4% increase this year, period. And this is the way to accomplish it. This is not in the merit system program yet and this is the way to accomplish it. That's what we want. Everybody to have a 4% increase. Next year it could be a different situation because in the merit program, some may get 1, some may get 2, and some may get 3. That's up to the merit program. But this year we want to make sure everybody gets a 4% increase. Not a 4 ½, not a 3 ½, but a 4. So however it works out then everybody gets their 4%, I'm 100% behind it.

Mayor McPherson: That's in the next piece of legislation coming.

Mr. Clemens: Yeah, but I mean how we clean it up to do it.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Baxter.

Mr. Baxter: Mr. Stake, thank you. Mayor, a question I'm having in my head here is, how many people do we have actually at that above or the highest level of the pay rate right now?

Mayor McPherson: Mr. Whitney, do you recall how many?

Mr. Whitney: Five.

Mr. Stake: Five?

Mayor McPherson: I was thinking four. Is it five? Four or five. I seem to remember four. Mr. Whitney remembers five. It's just a handful.

Mr. Baxter: Alright. That's what I thought. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Mayor, you have this marked as an emergency. Do we really need an emergency on this?

Mayor McPherson: The reason for the emergency is so that the rest of the rank and file employees can get their raises. The union members have got their increases. We have for all purposes, settled the Dispatchers' contract. You'll be getting that in about a week. And we'd kind of like to see our employees get their pay increases.

Mr. Stake: Mr. Clemens.

Mr. Clemens: I've got a question to ask. If the contract's not been signed yet, how did they get their increase?

Mayor McPherson: Well the contract is official when Council accepts it and the FOP votes and accepts it. The formality of the signing is to be done at 2:00 tomorrow.

Mr. Clemens: I'm just curious how that happens.

Mayor McPherson: That's how.

Mr. Clemens: Well even though Council accepts it, it's not legal until you sign it.

Mayor McPherson: Well, when we checked the labor counsel, they said that the mere fact that the FOP voted and accepted it, the City Council passed it and accepted it, that it was a binding contract and we can go ahead and pay.

Mr. Clemens: In other words, we do what the labor counsel says?

Mayor McPherson: Pretty much. We rely on the attorney Mel, you know that.

Mr. Clemens: It doesn't sound right to me. It's not legal until you sign it. Let's put it that way.

Mr. Stake: President Hills.

Mr. Hills: I would like to note, and it may be, if there's only four or five over the rate range, then there was some productivity came out of the Clemans, Nelson. Because there were 38 employees over the range prior to the Clemans, Nelson adjustment. I just counted the number on the ordinance. So for those people who would like to point and say, Clemans, Nelson didn't do anything, there were some substantial things done. If that is the correct number, if you don't mind double checking it Mayor, just to be sure.

Mayor McPherson: Absolutely.

Mr. Hills: We had 38 outside the range in December '02 for '03. But that again was prior to the adoption of the Clemans, Nelson adjustments.

Mayor McPherson: I will get with the Auditor and ask him again.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Hills. Any other questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Mrs. Frazier, does this have to be two motions?

Mrs. Frazier: Two ordinances.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I'm a quick learner. Okay. Well if I'm not hearing any objection from the table on the emergency language here, I guess we can move this forward. So I'll make the motion that we amend Chapter 160.08 to reflect the changes submitted here as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any discussion? I see Mr. Luzader back there raising his hand.

Mr. Luzader: If I could, Mr. Clemens said that he'd like to see that all the employees be treated the same. If I understand this legislation right, the people that are outside the range will just receive a lump sum payment. Therefore, that's going to effect their overtime rate, their retirement, the ones that are getting close to retirement as opposed to the ones that are still inside the range will get the 4% range added to their hourly rate which will also increase their overtime rate. In that case, that's not being fair to your long term, dedicated employees.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mr. Luzader. Any other comments or questions? Mr. Kipp.

Mr. Kipp: The Clemans, Nelson did address the adjusting of the top of the pay scale by the CPI each year. And that hasn't been done yet this year. I really don't know how that will effect the, if you passed one before the other, how that effects adding it to your pay. If you're close to the top, there are more than 5 people that are at the top of their pay. And some are closer than others. Some are quite a ways over the top of the pay. Others are fairly close. So it does effect it. I'm not sure how. Like if the 2.3 that was presented this year, if it's passed after this, does that mean then that wasn't added to the top of the pay scale or effect their pay following that?

Mr. Stake: Mr. Whitney, would you like to address that?

Mr. Whitney: I believe the intent is to move the scale up before you apply the 4%. And I believe that the 4 or 5 names were after the scale has been moved up.

Mayor McPherson: If I might, when we were talking about this briefly earlier, we had talked about running these programs simultaneously. And I think that's probably the way it should be done, is to run all of these simultaneously including the pay range adjustment that Council chooses to, if you want to take that along with the rest of them, it probably would be the safest way to do the

whole thing. And then that also would fall back to the example we read earlier where only a portion of that was going to go, it would be the 2.3 would be lumped in as their salary and then the 1.7 would be lump sum.

Mr. Stake: I guess I'm hearing conflicting advice on which one we need to do first in order for it to be worked out.

Mayor McPherson: My opinion would be simultaneously. But I guess that...

Mr. Hills: Well I think to keep, it was my understanding and the CPI what it is, is an adjustment to the ranges to keep the ranges current based on the changes in the Consumer Price Index.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: So they're not merits. They are a cost of living because it costs you 2.3% more to live on those same dollars this year. So I think the concept was, whether they're simultaneously or not, certainly the 2.3% increase in the ranges should be posted to the top end and the bottom end of everybody's range to move that up 2.3% and then the overall 4% lays down. The 2.3 doesn't change somebody's pay grade. That changes the ranges. And the 4% that lays back over that may mean that if they were sitting right at the range now, it's going to go up 2.3, they're going to get 2.3 in increases and 1.7 in bonus.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Hills: And they're going to sit right at the top of their range.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. But that 2.3 would go toward their base salary.

Mr. Hills: Absolutely. Because that's the new range.

Mayor McPherson: And I think that's what Mark is bringing up. Is that not correct, Mark? And that's why I say if it runs simultaneously, then that's all accomplished.

Mr. Hills: As long as the 2.3, I think Mr. Whitney's absolutely correct. In order to have the appropriate range, that needs to be adjusted first and then the 4% is reflected on that. Just to be sure, because I even heard that we're going to give people 6.3 raises. No we're not.

Mayor McPherson: No. Not a chance.

Mr. Hills: No, that one's not...that's not happening.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Why don't we do this then? Why don't we send this on for its first reading and then we can get the other one to catch up at the next committee meeting? And then if we need to add

emergency language later on we can do that. Because the one increasing the CPI is there for its third reading.

Mayor McPherson: Okay. Yeah, that's fine.

Mr. Stake: So then I will amend...

Mayor McPherson: And just for those that are here, the employees, we have requested it be retroactive to January 1. So even if it takes two weeks longer, everyone is going to get that back to January 1.

Mr. Stake: In the next couple of weeks, we can talk about this and see how we can make it as fair as possible to everybody if it's okay with the members of Council and the Administration. Do I need to withdraw that motion, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: Your initial one. Yes. Withdraw your first and then re-make the motion.

Mr. Stake: Okay. I'll withdraw my motion then. Mr. Beougher if you'll withdraw your second.

Mr. Beougher: Absolutely.

Mr. Stake: Thank you. Then I would like to send this on for a first reading to amend Chapter 160.08 as reflected in the information provided here tonight. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Then we have number 2 here, Amend Policy and Procedures Manual. And I guess that reflects what we're doing here in 160. Any questions or comments on that from members of the committee or members of Council? (No response). Then I will make the motion that we amend Chapter 3.20, the Policy and Procedures Manual as reflected in the information provided to us here tonight. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Here we come to the important one. Item number 6, Discussion, Authorize 4% pay increase for Chapter 160 employees and appropriation of funds.

Mayor McPherson: This is the piece of legislation wherein we're requesting the 4% pay increase for the 160 employees. We're asking that this pay increase be administered per the 160.08 which we covered earlier. And we have attached where the funds need to come from. There will be \$106,160 from General Fund money. \$40,573 from the other funds. The Storm Water, Tax, Water/Waste Water, Streets. We've asked that the effective date of the pay increase will be January 1, 2004.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mayor. Any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Anybody out there? Okay.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Thank you, Mayor. Then I guess we can just send this on for its first reading as well. So I will make a motion that we authorize pay increase of 4% for all employees covered by Chapter 160. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 7 is Discussion, Authorize and approve settlement and payment of \$39,278 to purchase right-of-way and temporary work easement, WeeJoySing, Graham/Main Improvement. And this comes from Mr. Underwood, I believe.

Mr. Underwood: Authorization to approve it. We have reached agreement with WeeJoySing and the Kirk's. The money is appropriated. It's already been appropriated. The extra 3,000 will be taken out of the contingency that we appropriated. So we're ready to go. I did the deed and the mortgage release today.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Very good. This is something we want to move along here. So we just need to authorize the settlement and the payment then. We don't need to appropriate any money. Does this just run its regular tract, Mr. Underwood?

Mr. Underwood: I think we ought to get this done, and done fast if we're not going to file the suit. Deposit the money with the court and they're going to want to bid it and start in. So the quicker we do it the better off we'll be.

Mr. Stake: Okay. This is something we've been discussing for a while, this issue at Main and Graham. Any comments or questions from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). I guess what I'm hearing, Mr. Underwood would like an emergency on this so we can get this moving quickly. So I will make a motion to approve and authorize settlement of payment of \$39,278 to purchase the right-of-way as an emergency. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 8 is adoption of the CIP. It's something we've been working on for a while. I appreciate all the work done by EM&T on this and the Mayor and his people. Mayor, go ahead.

Mayor McPherson: Thank you, Chairman Stake. You should all have in front of you, one of these books. This is the final draft dated June 7, I believe. Received June 8 but the actual pages I think you'll see are dated June 7, 2004. That is a recommendation for the CIP for the next five years. I think everyone needs to just remember this is a living document. This document is good today and may change tomorrow. But we need to have our CIP adopted for various other projects that we're involved in, various grants, some Issue 2 monies. And that you have in front of you. You'll see as you look through there, there are some projects that we moved way out 5, 6, 7 years. We have all the projects separated by fund. Whether it be General Fund, Street, Storm Water, or whatever so you can get an idea of projects that we feel are important. And as you read through there, you'll see that each one is prioritized as P1, P2, P3, or whatever. So we can add to or take away as our revenues increase or decrease. And I too would like to thank Dave Parkinson. He's done an excellent job putting all of the conversations that we've had and all the meetings that

we've had together. Any one that's sat in on the meetings know that some times they get pretty confusing. They get very lengthy. And arguments with what's a priority and what's not a priority and what needs to be done and what doesn't need to be done. So after many, many meetings and many, many hours of working on this, you have the document that we're recommending for the 2004 - 2008 Capital Improvements Project programs.

Mr. Stake: Okay, and I just would like to note that we are not including in here any longer projects where monies have been appropriated.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct. If it's been appropriated, its no longer a Capital Project that we're looking at doing. It's in the process. So they are no longer in here.

Mr. Stake: I think that helps clear up a little of the confusion too.

Mayor McPherson: That's correct.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor McPherson: I'd like to take credit for that but Mr. Parkinson suggested that to help eliminate some of the confusion we were having at our meetings. And I think it worked very well.

Mr. Stake: Well, we certainly have a lot here to digest. I imagine this would just go through the three reading process. We can have further discussion down the road. But to me it looks like we're fairly comprehensive here. Any questions from members of the committee? (No response). Comments? (No response). Members of Council? (No response).

Mayor McPherson: Thank you.

Mr. Stake: Okay. Thank you, Mayor. Well this has been around for a long, long time so I think we should start moving it forward. So I will, the motion I'd be making here, I don't have any legislative request at this time with this.

Mr. Hills: I think we had one.

Mr. Stake: Okay. See, Mr. Hills has it this time. I do. I had it buried in the back. So request adoption of 2004 - 2008 Capital Improvement Projects. So then I would recommend that we send on to Council the adoption of the 2004 to the 2008 Capital Improvement Projects. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Okay. Item number 9 is an Ordinance to amend Chapter 167 City Records Commission. It had its second reading on 5-24-04. I believe this is pretty straight forward. Members have had plenty of time to take a look at this. It's had its second reading and will be going on for its third. Do we have any questions or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send this on for its third reading with recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Beougher.

Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Item number 10 is a Resolution Adopting the Tax Budget of the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio for the Fiscal Year Beginning January 1, 2005. We had a public hearing on June 14. Second reading was also on June 14. And this is just something to get us prepared for next year. And I imagine between now and the end of the year we'll be having some changes to some of these numbers. As members of Council will know, our tax revenues are not what we thought they would be at this time for this year. So it's going to be I think, tough next year. So I hope the Administration will be planning according. And hopefully we'll work through any problems we have or any funding source problems we have. We'll figure it out along the way. But this I'd like to send forward for its third reading as well. Any comments or questions by members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we send forward the Resolution Adopting the Tax Budget for the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio for Fiscal Year Beginning January 1, 2005 with a recommendation for adoption. Do I have a second? Second by Mr. Clemens. Any further discussion? (No response). All in favor, state aye. (All voted "Aye"). Opposed? (No response). Motion passes.

Ordinance to amend the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual. A couple of things this deals with is, Workplace Violence and the Smoking Policy. I think we have the Workplace Violence Section A.1.e. worked out. We are still working on Section 7.05, Smoking/Tobacco Use. Mr. Clemens has had a lot to say on this. Go ahead.

Mr. Clemens: This is something I don't think we want to make cumbersome to everybody. It's something that I think, the Mayor and I have discussed it, I think it's something that we can work out to satisfaction of everybody that's involved. And I think that's what we're interested in. So I'd like to put it on hold and Bob and I will get together and discuss this and I think it can be worked out to where it's an administrative matter and we don't have to do legislation to control it. So I would like to work it out that way if we could. So just put this on hold and I'll get with the Mayor in the next week or so.

Mr. Stake: Okay. How about the Workplace Violence section? Would we want to send that forward at this time, Mrs. Frazier?

Mrs. Frazier: You can. You can amend it.

Mr. Clemens: That would be fine.

Mr. Stake: Both of these have had two readings. The Workplace Violence would be sent forward for its third reading and adoption. So I will make a motion... first of all, any further discussion or comments from members of the committee? (No response). Members of Council? (No response). Then I will make a motion that we amend the ordinance to reflect the change to the City of Reynoldsburg, Ohio Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual, Section 6.06, Workplace Violence only, and send it to Council for the third reading with a recommendation for adoption. Mr. Beougher seconded. All voted "Aye". (End of tape)

Mr. Beougher said he had done some research on the internet, and within twenty feet of a building

seemed to be the recommended distance as a non-smoking area. Mr. Clemens said the topic should be held and he would meet with the Mayor to see if something could be worked out. Item held.

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Finance Committee

- - -Nancy C. Frazier, Clerk of Council

(Transcribed - Susie Smith)

June 21, 2004